wiiich did proceed air; and from the ether was made the heavens, from fire the sun.—We see, therefore, that, it was not without cause, that Lu-cretius[a] did so highly extol Empedocles, since his physiology was really the same with that of Epicurus and Democritus ; only that he differed from them in some particularities, as in excluding a va-cuum, and denying such physical minima as were indivisible.

xv. As for Anaxagoras, though he philosophized by Atoms, substituting concretion and secretion, in the room of generation and corruption, insisting upon the same fundamental principle, that Empedocles, Democritus, and the other Atomists did; which was (as we shall declare more fully afterward) that nothing could be made out dPtibthing, nor reduced to nothing; and there-fore^that there were neither any new productions, uor destructions of any substances or real entities: yet, as his Homceomeria is represented by Aristotle, Lucretius, and other authors, that bone was pide of bony atoms, and flesh of fleshy, red things of red atoms, and hot things of hot atoms ; these atoms being supposed to be endued originally with so many several forms and qualities essential to them, and inseparable from them, there was indeed a wide difference between his philosophy and the Atomical. However,, this seems to have had its rise from nothing else but this philo-sopher's not being able to understand the Atomical hypothesis, which made him decline it, and substitute this spurious and counterfeit Atomism of his own in the room of it.

xvi. Lastly, I might add here, that it isrecord-

* Lib. i.vers. 744,746.